



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

my mind not without importance. In both verse 4 and 6, *γῆν* and *ρῖζαν* occur as direct objects, while in v. 5, we have the descriptive genitive *γῆς* depending on *βάθος*. Thus there certainly is something in the construction of v. 5, that could have suggested to the translator the use of a partitive genitive; while in vv. 4 and 6 nothing of the kind is to be found.

The genitive *diupaizos airpos* is, therefore, far less surprising than the use of *hairdeis* in Matt. ix, 36; for there it was in no way suggested by the Greek construction: *πρόβατα οὐχ ἔχοντα ποιμένα*. And yet Professor Hart seems to find no great difficulty in the explanation of the construction of this last passage; and Bernhardt in his Vulfila edition merely makes the following note:

"eigentümliche anwendung des teilungsgenitivs, vergleichbar dem französischen *des brebis qui n'ont pas de pasteur*. Vergl. meine abhandlung in Zacher's Zeitschrift, bd. ii, p. 292 ff."

To this article, which perhaps would throw further light on the subject, I unfortunately do not have access.

I may add that Heyne, on p. 426 of the eighth edition, gives the following general rule which would apply to both the passages quoted:

'Ein weiterer häufiger gebrauch des genitivs als object findet da statt, wo nicht so sehr das ganze, sondern nur ein unbestimmter teil desselben gemeint ist, was im Deutschen meist ohne artikel oder durch *von* gegeben wird, besonders bei *haban* und *wisan* mit der negation.'

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

Schulze's 'Gotisches Glossar' cites a number of indisputable examples of the use of the partitive genitive after *ni*, while Bernhardt's article above referred to proves that this construction occurs even without the negation. See also Grimm's 'Grammatik' 4, 961.

H. C. G. V. JAGEMANN.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—When on reading Mr. Strunk's emendation, I consulted my copy of Balg's 'Syntax,' I found Apelt's interpolation recorded. The passage in question (Luke iv, 36), the

only instance of an acc. c. inf. after *varþ*, has been a crux with several grammarians. Apelt in his article 'Ueber den acc. c. inf. im gothischen,' *Germania* xix, 280, tries to show, if I remember correctly, that this construction after impersonal verbs is not genuine in Gothic, and, among others, proposes the emendation now offered by Mr. Strunk. Bopp takes *varþ*, in this case, as a verb of motion ("überfiel") and *afslauþnan* as a noun (cf. also Gab. and Loebe, 'Glossary'). Apelt adds *ana*, as a translation of *ἐπι*: *varþ afslauþnan ana allans*. Mr. Strunk's emendation differs from that of Apelt only in so far as he substitutes *afslauþn* for *afslauþnan*, and accounts for the *ana* (cf. a similar emendation to Massmann's reading, *an[a]airpai*, Skeir. iv, d). The only difficulty consists in proving the correctness of this poem. Both *afslauþjan* and *afslauþnan* require a **sluþpan* ii as simplex. We should expect a fem. noun with *-ni*-suffix, which would, however, not solve the difficulty, while the postulated neuter, with *-no*-suffix, would belong to a class of which only a few traces are left in Gothic.

As to the other emendation proposed in the February number of the NOTES, I do not suppose that Professor Hart will insist on its consideration. Aside from the syntactical impossibility of *izos airpos*, the passage does not need any correction. The genitive with *ni haban* is logically related to that after verbs like *þaurban*, *ni visan*, and it is not restricted to the two examples mentioned by Balg (§ 25), namely, John ix, 41; Ephes. v, 27. *Haban* used affirmatively, does not take the genitive.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Mississippi.

SIDNEY AND GIORDANO BRUNO.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In an article on 'Giordano Bruno and Shakespeare,' published in the 'Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft,' vol. 26 (1891), pp. 258-308, Dr. Robert Beyersdorff attempts to show, in opposition to the views of Tschischwitz and König, that Shakespeare was uninfluenced by Bruno. Not content with this, he assumes that Bruno had no influence